



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,945	12/14/2001	Kurt Albert Grassman	DE920000087US1	7397
7590	09/09/2005		EXAMINER	
Floyd A. Gonzalez IBM Corporation 2455 South Road, P386 Poughkeepsie, NY 12401			RAMPURIA, SATISH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2191	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/016,945

Applicant(s)

GRASSMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Satish S. Rampuria

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/17/2005.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment received on 02/17/2005.
2. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 to claims 1-7 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
3. Claims amended by the applicant: 1, 8, and 15.
4. Claims pending in the application: 1-21.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of new ground(s) of rejection.
6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
7. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,999,740 to Rowley (hereinafter called Rowley) in view of US Patent No. 5,948,101 to David et al. (hereinafter called David).

Per claim 1:

Rowley disclose:

- A method for updating programs (col. 1, line 28 “a software update mechanism”) to be used in a network (col. 1, line 33 “from the remote server”) the method comprising the steps of:
- providing a network comprised of a plurality of first type computers having a limited function range relative to a plurality of second type computers having a respective extended function range (col. 2, lines “a number of client computer”);
- providing in said network, a service being defined as comprising update services providing an updated facilities version to be performed by the second type computers to said first type computers (col. 2, lines 13-18 “the server has number of application directories one for each application... holds the new or amended application files for different versions of the application...”);

Art Unit: 2191

- selecting a first subgroup comprising at least one first type computer (col. 2, lines 1-2 “a computer network comprising a number of client computers”);
- selecting a second subgroup comprising at least one of the second type of computers (col. 2, lines 2-3 “a number of server computers”) for providing said updated facilities version exclusively to first type computers (col. 2, lines 12-18 “the server has a number of application directories... holds... application files for different versions of the application”) until a predetermined condition has occurred (col. 2, lines 41-42 “flag which indicates access permissions of the file”);
- loading said at least one computer of the first subgroup with said updated facilities version (col. 3, lines 43-44 “upload a new or updated version of a software application onto the servers”) during continued operation of the unselected plurality of first type computers with a former version means (col. 4, lines 12-13 “uploader displays a list of the existing software applications, along with their version numbers”).

Rowley does not explicitly disclose issuing reboot requests exclusively from at least one of the second type of computers in said second subgroup to at least one of the first type of computers in said first subgroup; and responsive to said reboot request, sending boot messages from said at least one of the first type computer in said first subgroup to said at least one of said second type computer in the second subgroup.

However, David discloses in an analogous computer system issuing reboot requests exclusively from at least one of the second type of computers in said second subgroup to at least one of the first type of computers in said first subgroup; and responsive to said reboot request,

Art Unit: 2191

sending boot messages from said at least one of the first type computer in said first subgroup to said at least one of said second type computer in the second subgroup (col. 4, lines 32-42 “OMC 37 is powered-up or reset such that booting thereof begins, STEP 121. OMC 37 reads a bootstrap loader program from ROM 39 and begin executing it. The bootstrap program reads seed letterbug 43 and broadcasts a boot request therewith onto network 15, STEP 123. This boot request is of the same type that CPs 11 use to boot (serviced by boot server 19 within server 17). However, according to the present invention, instead of transmitting a conventional particularized letterbug, seed letterbug 43 is transmitted”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of requesting a program to during the rebooting of computer as taught by David into the method of updating the software/program as taught by Rowley. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have a request during the boot up of a computer to have an up-to-date program as suggested by David (col. 1 to 2, lines 57-66 and 1-20).

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Rowley disclose:

- distributing the updated facilities version among the second type of computers (col. 3, lines 42-43 “upload a new or updated version of a software application onto the servers”).

Although, Rowley teach provide the mechanism for updating the program/software. Rowley is silent on preventing computers from providing services as long as they are not equipped with the updated facilities version. However, this feature deemed to be inherent to the Rowley system, Rowley system shows updating only those which needed update without going through a full

Art Unit: 2191

upload of the application, col. 4, lines 48-51. Rowley system would not function properly if the un-updated version were running with an updated version of application.

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Rowley disclose:

- which said first type of computers are embedded controllers (col. 2, lines 1-2 “a number of sever computers”) and the service of the second type computers comprising the provision of code loads to the first type of computers (col. 4, lines 8-9 “files server 102 stores a number of application files 104, forming a number of software applications”).

Claims 8, 10-11 are the apparatus claims corresponding to method claims 1, 3-4 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1, 3-4 respectively, above.

Claims 15, 17-18 are the computer program product claims corresponding to method claims 1, 3-4 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1, 3-4 respectively, above.

10. Claims 2, 9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley in view of David and further in view of US Patent No. 6,701,356 to Conduct et al. (hereinafter called Conduct).

Per claim 2:

- distributing said updated facilities version over the remaining plurality of unselected computers (col. 3, lines 42-43 “upload a new or updated version of a software application onto the servers”).

Rowley does not explicitly disclose testing at least one computer of the first subgroup with said updated facilities version during continued operation of the unselected plurality of first type computers and if a test result corresponds to a predetermined result scheme.

However, Condict discloses in an analogous computer system testing at least one computer of the first subgroup with said updated facilities version during continued operation of the unselected plurality of first type computers and if a test result corresponds to a predetermined result scheme (col. 9, lines 28-30 “verification testing... performed to verify the network is operation... testing is complete the new SPF images are ready”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of testing the network operation for updated SPF images as taught by Condict into the method of updating the software/program as taught by the combination system of Rowley and David. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to test the updated version of software to ensure the proper operation of the software as suggested by Condict (col. 3, lines 38-50).

Claim 9 is the apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 2 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 2 above.

Claims 16 is the computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 2 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 2 above.

Art Unit: 2191

11. Claim 5-7, 12-14, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley in view of David and further in view of US Patent No. 6,480,901 to Weber et al. (hereinafter called Weber).

Per claim 5-7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Rowley does not explicitly disclose updating programs in an enterprise network.

However, Weber discloses in an analogous computer system updating programs in an enterprise network (col. 4, lines 49-51 "communicate with all I/O devices on the enterprise, operations such as "firmware upgrades" may be performed en mass to common device types").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of updating firmware on a enterprise network as taught by Weber into the method of updating the software/program as taught by the combination system of Rowley and David. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have updating program on the enterprise network to provide the updated to the devices connected via proxy devices as suggested by Weber (col. 2, lines 3-20).

Claims 12-14 are the apparatus claims corresponding to method claims 5-7 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 5-7 respectively, above.

Art Unit: 2191

Claims 19-21 are the computer program product claims corresponding to method claims 5-7 respectively, and rejected under the same rationale set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 5-7 respectively, above.


Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Satish S. Rampuria** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3732**. The examiner can normally be reached on **8:30 am to 5:00 pm** Monday to Friday except every other Friday and federal holidays. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100**

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Tuan Q. Dam** can be reached on **(571) 272-3695**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner/Software Engineer
Art Unit 2191
09/06/2005


TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER